DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 110 SP 014 408

AUTHOR Callaway, Rolland
TITLE Teachers' Beliefs Concerning Values and the Functions and Purposes of Schooling.
PUB DATE May 79
NOTE 17p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Decision Making; *Educational Philosophy; Educational Research; *Humanistic Education; Humanization; Personal Values; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Role; *Values

ABSTRACT

Research into the definition and the priority structuring of eight values-oriented elements reveals a variety of differences associated with teacher (and preservice teacher) age, sex, and professional level. A study of 246 graduate and undergraduate students at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee education department established significant patterns for the values of affection, enlightenment, power, rectitude, respect, skill, wealth, and well-being. Subjects identify each of these values as either a specific objective of education (purpose) or as an incidental effect of the educative system (function), and ranked the values in terms of perceived importance. Resultant data, compiled in the form of statistical and percentile charts, illustrated the role that the teacher cannot help but play in the transmission and formation of cultural, personal, and social values. (IH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED177110

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Rolland Callaway
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TEACHERS' BELIEFS CONCERNING VALUES AND THE FUNCTIONS AND PURPOSES OF SCHOOLING

Rolland Callaway
School of Education
University of Wisconsin Milwaukee

The study reported here stemmed from what has been a perennial concern of those who have strived to research and/or change the nature of education and schooling. That is, what to do with the teacher as a variable?

There have been innumerable attempts to deal with this concern. In the research paradigm, for example, one would flip the teacher from "experimental" to "control" so the teacher doesn't make "the" difference. In some of the instructional technology approaches, materials were designed to be "teacher-proof." At the other extreme, there has been the view, most recently espoused by Zahorik (1) for example, that the concern must be attacked via teachers' values and philosophy.

My consciousness and concern about the teacher as variable has varied from time to time in my professional career. I recall studying "Philosophy of Education" as an undergraduate and wondering what that had to do with my survival as a student teacher. And then I recall all of those graduate courses I took as a teacher and administrator - the constant struggle with the theory-practice dilemma with the teacher as variable right in the middle, if not in fact the cause, of it. And then as a university professor trying to

SP 014 408

* Prepared for paper presentation. Please do not reproduce without permission of the author.

do something which might reasonably be called research in the context of the complex social institution we call "education."

There have been several specific influences which prompted the study reported here. First, I was struck by the paper which Macdonald (2) presented in 1976 at the Milwaukee conference on curriculum theory. While Macdonald was basically "talking" to curriculum theorists (whatever and wherever they are) I think his comments relate to teachers as well as curriculum theorists:

> ....It is a failure of theorists to explicitly state the value base of their work. There is no way theorists can avoid assuming choices of value and implying them in their work.

Another influence occurred at the curriculum theory conference held in Rochester, N.Y. in 1973. Maxine Greene (3) in her presentation at that conference referred to Paulo Freire and his idea of a"Learning situation in which persons were to be liberated through 'action and reflection' on the world as they experience it." In her words, learners were"to be enabled to identify the causes of their own oppressive reality, and, having understood those causes, they were to choose themselves as persons who could change the given into what they thought ought to be." I distinctly recall listening to her comments and saying to myself, you and Freire focus on the learner, the student-but what about the teacher? Later on she answers:

> I happen to believe that this kind of awakening can still occur in schools, at least where there are teachers who no longer lead mechanical lives. ...The trouble is, of course, that most people are too immersed in daily life to be aware of how they constitute their worlds.

She goes on to say:

> ..."Having themselves experienced what it means to be aroused to weariness and amazement, they have to think of ways of awakening others, the others, who are submerged. How can they be awakened to pursue the clarity needed for self-consciousness? How can they be persuaded to be vigilant, not only with respect to oppression, but with respect to abstraction and indifference - the indifference Camus (in another work) associated with "plague?"

> ...To have plague is not only to be indifferent, it is to be abstract, to use "big" words like humanization, democratization, and self-actualization in order to obscure what is actually happening between the person [the teacher] and his world. I want to stress the fact that Tarrou [Camus, The Plague] can only say all this after he has told the story of his life to someone, after he has recalled some of his earliest perceptions of the world and his gradual constitution of the meanings of "plague..."
>
> I speak of all this because the recovery of one's own biography is necessary if one is to become aware of how one has constituted meanings of the course of one's life, how one has brought into being the traditions by which one lives and the horizons toward which one occasionally yearns. The learner, [in my case the teacher] after all, is the one who must effect relationships among his manifold experiences.

I will not go on with her comments; other than to restate my concern with the teacher as learner - the teacher who in my view, if he/she is to be true to learners and teaching as a profession, must "in the recovery of one's own biography" develop values and a value system. (At one point I thought I might title this paper: Do Teachers Have Plague?)

Another influence in relation to my concern about teachers and values was Decker Walker's (4) 1971 article in which he proposed a "naturalistic model" for curriculum development consisting of three elements: "platform, "design," and "deliberation." He suggests that the classical model, i.e., the Bobbit-Tyler model, "neglects or distorts important aspects of contemporary practice in curriculum development." Of particular interest was his notion about values or the "platform" as he describes it:

> The curriculum developer [the teacher] does not begin with a blank slate. He could not begin without some notion of what is possible and desirable educationally. The system of beliefs and values that the curriculum developer brings to his task and that guides the development of the curriculum is what I call the curriculm's platform.

Walker notes that:

> The model itself contains propositions that need to be tested. According to the model, curriculum designers have platforms which strongly influence their deliberation and their final design. Do curriculum development groups in fact share a greater body of common beliefs than one would expect of groups of similar composition? Do the curriculum developer's justifications appeal to the body of shared beliefs? Do curriculum-making groups with similar platforms conduct

similar deliberations and produce similar curriculum designs. As I have indicated, I am primarily concerned with the question of teachers' values - teachers as curriculum developers. What are their platforms?

Another influence was the data from a follow up study of "A Research Oriented Elementary Education Student Teaching Program." (5) Jim Macdonald was the principal investigator of this USOE project which was designed "to foster more experimental and analytic attitudes toward teaching, rather than the typical postponement of a concern for research until graduate study." While the findings of the follow-up proved to be quite interesting in regard to the basic intent of the project, a "concomitant learning" seemed to reveal something about where teachers tend to "come from" as the saying goes. The respondents in the follow-up study were asked to indicate what tends to influence their ideas about education and schooling. If this study is any indication, teachers base their teaching decisions and behaviors on 1) their own teaching and experience, 2) the opinions and behavior of their students, and 3) their fellow teachers. This seems to be consistent with some of the thinking and research of my colleague John Zahorik. I think he refers to this phenomenon as "folk-knowledge." But what does this say about teachers' values and value system in their decision making?

Zahorik (1), following his discussion of our failure to come up with a "science" of education and teaching via the research route, suggests that a more propitious route would be to use the teachers' values as the basis for decision-making. While I am generally inclined to agree with this position, I cannot resist raising several questions which are related to the study reported here.

First, unless I misunderstand, he intimates that research on teaching vis-a-vis the experimental mode is value free. I don't believe it! A corollary notion is that a value position is not/could not/should not be based on re-

search evidence. Why not?

Another question has to do with the age-old definition problem. Zahorik says: "Taking a cue from Phenix, one can view a value as a belief or a conviction that something is good or desirable." I suggest taking a cue from Louis Raths (7) and his "operational definition" of a value. By the way, Raths has said that most of us have no values at all. Beliefs, attitudes, feelings - but not values according to his definition. Raths states:

1. A value implies prizing and cherishing.
2. A value implies choice after deliberation.
3. A value - as such - implies recurrence of the valuing act.
4. A value penetrates our living.
5. When asked about our values, we affirm them.

This definition of a value poses two other questions about the position Zahorik espouses, i.e. values serving as a basis for teachers' decision-making. One is the question as to whether people actually behave in regard to their values - if they have any? The second question was raised many years ago by Smith, Stanley and Shores (8) in their chapter on "The Validation of Educational Objectives." One criterion they identify is that of "Consistency and Noncontradiction." Thus, the question of the logical consistency, or at least noncontradiction, of the teacher's values.

Finally, my general awareness concerning the question of teachers and their values stemmed from my long-time effort to deal with the problem in my curriculum theory and planning classes. Assuming the notion that teachers' curricular and instructional decisions should come from some value base and orientation, I became increasingly amazed and disturbed that 1) teachers really seem to have no consistent, non-contradictory value orientation upon which to base their decisions, 2) many have really never given the question

any serious thought, and 3) there seems to be a tendency to think it doesn't make a lot of difference anyway. So, I determined to collect some data - to try to get at this concern in a more systematic way.

THE STUDY AND THE INSTRUMENT:

After many interesting - but often frustrating - classes where people find that their beliefs and values concerning the educational enterprise differ to a great degree, I developed an instrument which was primarily designed as a vehicle for class discussion. I want to make two points at this juncture. First, I found in my teaching that unless some type of "instrument" was used to get people to "put down" what their beliefs and values are, they are quite happy to be "wishy-washy." In other words, the "putting down" demands at least a tentative commitment. Second, I fully realize that "putting down" does not necessarily mean that this is what the respondent actually believes and values. As a matter of fact, I have noticed that many teachers and administrators have a very definite need to be "right" and tend to resist specifying their beliefs and values. (I have had interesting discussions as to how and where this trait is developed.) So, the instrument for the study was developed primarily to be used as a vehicle for class discussion and focuses on two basic questions:

1. What do teachers (and others) believe the functions and purposes of schools and schooling should be in relation to other institutions, i.e., the family, the church, the mass media, etc.
2. What do teachers (and others) believe the functions and purposes of schooling ought to be?

The first part of the instrument is based on Harold Lasswell's (9) discussion of social process and institutions in which he states that "Man seeks values through institutions using resources." He identifies the following eight "values" which he contends all people share and for which all institu-

tions share some responsibility:

1. AFFECTION: refers to the degree of love and friendship of persons in primary and secondary relationships. Primary refers to person-to-person relationship, secondary to more remote ones.

2. ENLIGHTENMENT: refers to information about the past and present, as well as estimates of future relative to making important decisions. Enlightenment may be identified as the knowledge necessary to make important decisions.

3. POWER: refers to the degree to which a person participates in the process of making important decisions. In all societies decision making involves power.

4. RECTITUDE: refers to the degree of moral practices and ethical standards.

5. RESPECT: refers to the degree of recognition given to persons in their capacity as human beings.

6. SKILL: refers to the degree of development of talents. The broad headings of physical and mental skills include motor skills, thinking skills, communication skills, social skills, and aesthetic skills.

7. WEALTH: refers to the degree to which individuals have access to goods and services.

8. WELL-BEING: refers to the degree of one's mental and physical health.

The respondents were asked to rank the eight values as to the extent they believe formal schooling should be responsible for the preservation and development of these values in our society. They were also asked to indicate whether they believe that the role of the school in regard to each of the

values represents a "function" or a "purpose." The distinction between function and purpose was presented as follows:

> A function is considered a consequence of schooling. It happens, but it is not a basic intention of the school to accomplish it. Providing for custody and feeding students are examples of functions of schools. A purpose of schooling is an object or end to be attained. Developing reading and mathematics skills are illustrations of purposes.

On the second part of the instrument the respondents were asked to rank from "most important" to "least important" eleven Educational Goals which were identified by an advisory task force of the Wisconisn Department of Public Instruction.(10) They were also asked to indicate whether each of the eleven goals represents a "Function" or a "Purpose."

RESULTS:

The population for the study consisted of 246 students in graduate classes in curriculum and instruction or in an undergraduate teacher education program at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Obviously, it is difficult to say to what extent these results can be generalized to the total population of teachers and prospective teachers. However, they do provide some interesting data for discussion. For instance, it has been interesting to ask each student to complete the instrument, discuss the individual responses in small groups, and then compare their responses with an N of 246. The instrument also tends to generate interesting discussions about the "definitions" of the values and goals.

Table 1 indicates the way the respondents ranked the eight values and the percentage of those indicating whether the value should be a function or purpose of schooling. Note that there is no difference in the ranking by sex.

Table 1

Rank Order of Eight Values and Percentage Indicating the Values as a Purpose by Sex
N=246

	FEMALE (N=168)			Male (N=78)		
	Rank	Mean	%	Rank	Mean	%
AFFECTION	5	4.72	29	5	4.65	25
ENLIGHTENMENT	2	2.80	92	2	3.03	90
POWER	7	5.85	52	7	5.86	56
RECTITUDE	6	4.83	40	6	4.97	42
RESPECT	3	3.65	61	3	3.58	44
SKILL	1	2.72	95	1	2.60	96
WEALTH	8	7.39	11	8	7.35	14
WELL-BEING	4	3.93	58	4	3.96	56

The high rank of Skill and Enlightenment is consistent with the traditional view of the purposes of schooling. There is an interesting discrepancy (or something) in regard to "Respect" and "Rectitude." Tradition and history indicate that Rectitude, i.e. the inculcation of moral practices and standards, should be ranked third and be a Purpose rather than Function.

The distinction between function and purpose is rather clear cut in regard to Skill and Enlightenment and in regard to Affection and Wealth. Class discussions concerning Wealth and Power are extremely interesting. It is almost as if teachers don't want to talk about such notions. Evidently it just isn't considered quite right to say that Wealth and Power are what schooling is about. In this context, one wonders about the whole business of career education.

The only substantial difference by sex is that females tend to view Respect as Purpose rather than Function.

The responses have also been analyzed according to age and teaching level. The ranking by age (21 and less, 22-30, 31-44, 45+) were the same except for the 45+ age group. The younger group rankings were: 1) Skill, 2) Enlightenment, 3) Respect, 4) Well-Being, 5) Affection, 6) Rectitude, 7) Power, 8) Wealth. the 45+ group ranked Respect as one, Enlightenment as two and Skill and Well-Being tied for third. An interesting difference!

Skill, Enlightenment, and Respect were ranked one, two, three by all teaching levels (See Table 2). The only substantial difference occurred in regard to Affection. The Elementary group ranked it fifth while the Post-secondary ranked it seventh.

As indicated in Table 2, there are some differences by level in the Function/Purpose distinction.

Table 2

Rank Order of Eight Values and Percentage Indicating the Values as a Purpose by Teaching Level
N=157*

	Elem. (N=81)			JH/MS(N=24)			Sec. (N=38)			Postsec.(N=14)		
	Rank	Mean	%	Rank	Mean	%	Rank	Mean	%	Rank	Mean	%
AFFECTION	5	4.71	25	6	5.27	18	5	4.40	31	7	5.43	17
ENLIGHTENMENT	2	2.91	94	2	2.95	91	2	3.06	92	2	2.29	92
POWER	7	5.69	56	7	5.50	59	7	6.51	50	6	5.36	75
RECTITUDE	6	4.80	30	4	4.27	59	6	5.00	47	4	4.79	25
RESPECT	3	3.71	58	3	3.50	41	3	3.23	50	3.	4.00	33
SKILL	1	2.79	96	1	2.36	91	1	3.00	94	1	1.50	100
WEALTH	8	7.31	16	8	7.59	14	8	7.45	11	8	7.43	17
WELL-BEING	4	3.97	59	5	4.55	41	4	3.40	64	5	5.00	50

* The total N is less than 246 because a number of the undergraduates did not indicate a teaching level.

For example, note that more Junior High/Middle School and Secondary people feel that Rectitude is a Purpose rather than a Function. There is also an interesting difference in regard to Affection and Power - more elementary and secondary people feel that Affection is a Purpose, and a greater percentage of the Postsecondary people tend to view Power as a Purpose of schooling.

Table 3 indicates the way the respondents ranked the eleven Educational Goals. It should be noted that the Task Force which identified the Eleven Goals did not rank them according to importance. Also, note that they were

Table 3

Rank Order of Eleven Goals and Percentage Indicating the Goal as a Purpose by Sex
N=246

	FEMALE (168)			MALE (78)		
	Rank	Mean	%	Rank	Mean	%
Basic Skills	1	3.16	89	2	3.51	90
Career Education	7	6.73	71	6	6.25	70
Citizenship	10	8.26	59	8	7.33	49
Creative Thinking	3	3.41	81	1	3.45	69
Cultural Appreciation	8	7.66	50	10	8.08	28
Economic Understanding	11	9.15	60	11	8.88	59
Human Relations	4	4.60	54	4	4.92	35
Lifelong Learning	5	5.63	40	7	6.32	37
Mental & Physical Health	6	6.3	54	5	5.68	58
Physical Environment	9	7.93	50	9	7.71	49
Self-Realization	2	3.34	62	3	3.72	54

presented to the respondents in alphabetical order. They were asked to rank the goals from "most important" to "least important" in relation to what the individual respondent believes the broad, general purposes of the schools ought to be. The instrument included a brief "definition" of each of the goals. However, differences of "definition" as perceived by individuals creates a good deal of discussion.

As indicated in Table 3, there are a number of differences in ranking by sex. It is interesting that the males ranked Citizenship tenth, while the females ranked it eighth. But perhaps even more interesting is that such a "traditional" goal is ranked so low by both. The females rank Basic Skills first and Creative Thinking third while the males rank Creative Thinking first and Basic Skills second. Interesting! The females rank both Cultural Appreciation and Lifelong Learning as more important than do the males.

The investigator has been intrigued with the fact that Physical Environment and Economic Understanding are generally ranked quite low. This would seem to be surprising considering the emphasis given to such in the media, etc. When pressed as to why goals such as Physical Environment, Economic Understanding and Citizenship ranked so low and tend to be viewed as Function rather than Purpose the reaction (often rather defensive) seems to be, "Oh, I meant to rank them higher but..."

The respondents do have difficulty distinguishing between Function and Purpose. However, after some discussion most seem to feel the distinction does help them clarify their thinking - possibly their values? There is overwhelming agreement that Basic Skills is a Purpose. After that there is Creative Thinking with 81% (female) and 69% (male) indicating it is a Purpose. Next in line is Career Education with 71% (female) and 70% (male). There are a couple of interesting differences between females and males in the Function/Purpose distinction. Fifty percent of the females feel Cultural Appreciation is a

Purpose while only twenty-eight percent of the males do. Fifty-four percent of the females feel Human Relations is a Purpose while only thirty-five percent of the males feel the same way.

There were also several differences in the ranking by age and level as indicated in Table 4 and Table 5. Note that for these Tables the goals are not

Table 4

RANK-ORDER OF GOALS BY AGE
N=244

RANK: TOTAL POPULATION (N=244)	21 & Less (N=29)	22-30 (N=128)	31-44 (N=75)	45+ (N=12)
1. BASIC SKILL	1	2.5	1	1
2. CREATIVE CONSTRUCTIVE & CRITICAL THINKING	3	1	2	2
3. SELF-REALIZATION	2	2.5	3	3
4. HUMAN RELATIONS	4	4	4	4
5. LIFELONG LEARNING	6	6	5	6.5
6. MENTAL & PHYSICAL HEALTH	5	5	7	6.5
7. CAREER EDUCATION & EDUCATIONAL COMPETENCE	7	7	6	6
8. CULTURAL APPRECIATION	8	8	10	9
9. CITIZENSHIP & POLITICAL UNDERSTANDING	10	10	8	8
10. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	9	9	9	11
11. ECONOMIC UNDERSTANDING	11	11	11	10

listed alphabetically but more by rank order. In regard to age, the biggest difference was in regard to Mental and Physical Health with the "older"

teachers indicating it is less important. On the other hand, they view Citizenship as more important. The 45+ age group feel that Physical Environment is less important than the other age groups.

Table 5

RANK-ORDER OF GOALS BY LEVEL
N=157*

	Elem. (N=81)	Jr. HI/MS (N=24)	Secondary (N=38)	Post Secondary (N=14)
1. BASIC SKILL	1	3	1	2
2. CREATIVE CONSTRUCTIVE & CRITICAL THINKING	2	2	2	1
3. SELF-REALIZATION	3	1	3	3
4. HUMAN RELATIONS	4	4	4	4
5. LIFELONG LEARNING	6	5	6	6
6. MENTAL & PHYSICAL HEALTH	7	8	7	5
7. CAREER EDUCATION & EDUCATIONAL COMPETENCE	7	8	7	5
8. CULTURAL APPRECIATION	10	10	10	10.5
9. CITIZENSHIP & POLITICAL UNDERSTANDING	9	7	8	9
10. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	8	9	9	8
11. ECONOMIC UNDERSTANDING	11	11	11	10.5

*The total N is less than 246 because a number of the undergraduates did not indicate teaching level.

Perhaps the most interesting difference in ranking by teaching level is the difference of the 1, 2, 3 rank by the Junior High/Middle School group. This would seem to be consistent with the theory and literature on programs for this age level. Another difference that stands out is the higher ranking

the Postsecondary people give to Mental and Physical Health and Career Education. The emphasis on Career Education is understandable since the Postsecondary people were vocational teachers or in nursing education.

The distinctions between Function and Purpose according to age and teaching level tended to parallel the rank order of the goals. This tended to be the case for sex as well. That is, the lower the goal is ranked, the more apt it is to be viewed as Function rather than Purpose.

In conclusion, I return to my original concern and questions. The concern: what to do with the teacher as variable? Perhaps in long run, there is no option. The real world of schools and schooling will be determined by the teacher. But, if that is the case, what are teachers' beliefs, attitudes, feelings, and values? What do teachers believe the functions and purposes of schools and schooling should be in relation to other social institutions? What do they believe the functions and purposes of schooling ought to be? And, finally, to what extent do teachers' beliefs, attitudes, feelings and values affect their curriculuar and instructional decisions?

What I have attempted to do in this study is to try to gather some data in a somewhat systematic way about the functions/purposes and other institutions question and the functions/purposes "ought" question. I make no case concerning the generalizability of the data reported here. As I have said, I was primarily interested in raising the level of awareness of the teachers I work with.

Finally, however, I do believe the data from this study does indicate some very intriguing differences--and raises some very interesting questions--about where our teachers are "coming from." If we are right--i.e., the teachers values and value system does and ought to influence their curricular and instructional decisions perhaps we need to do more about raising their level of consciousness about what those beliefs, feelings and values are.

REFERENCES:

1. John A. Zahorik. "How To Decide How To Teach." The Elementary School Journal, Vol. 78, Number 1, September 1977, pp. 23-30.

2. James B. Macdonald. "Value-based Curriculum." Paper read at the Milwaukee Curriculum Theory Conference, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, November 13, 1976.

3. Maxine Greene. "V. Cognition, Consciousness, and Curriculum." Heightened Consciousness, Cultural Revolution, and Curriculum Theory, pp. 69-84. Edited by William Pinar. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1974.

4. Decker F. Walker. "A Naturalistic Model for Curriculum Development." School Review, November, 1971, pp. 51-64.

5. James B. Macdonald, et al. A Research Oriented Elementary Education Student Teaching Program, Cooperative Research Project No. 1091. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 1965.

6. Rolland Callaway and Steven Baruch. "A Research Oriented Elementary Education Student Teaching Program: A Follow-up Study." Research in Education (ED 135776), July, 1977.

7. Louis Raths. "Sociological Knowledge and Needed Curriculum Research." Research Frontiers in the Study of Children's Learning, pp. 20-34. Edited by James B. Macdonald. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 1960. (I realize there are more recent publications dealing with Rath's ideas but this was where I first heard them.)

8. B. Othanel Smith, William O. Stanley and J. Harlan Shores. Fundamentals of Curriculum Development, Revised Edition. Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: World Book Company, 1957.

9. Harold Lasswell. Taken from the film "Social Process and Institutions."

10. Advisory Task Force on Educational Goals. Educational Goals. Madison, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 1972.